



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,489	06/09/2005	Murray Figov	91255MGB	7114
1333	7590	08/14/2006	EXAMINER	
PATENT LEGAL STAFF EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY 343 STATE STREET ROCHESTER, NY 14650-2201			ZIMMERMAN, JOSHUA D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2854	

DATE MAILED: 08/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/538,489

Applicant(s)

FIGOV, MURRAY

Examiner

Joshua D. Zimmerman

Art Unit

2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 31-37 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30, 38 and 39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/4/2006.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of Group I in the reply filed on 06/26/2006 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Claims 31-37 are therefore withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 21 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Regarding claim 21, applicant does not describe in the specification a method wherein the coating comprising the elements claimed in claim 21 is made hydrophobic. The coating as claimed, and described in the specification, results only in a hydrophilic surface, which only allows the imaging accomplished by the ink jet ink to switch the properties of the blank from hydrophilic to oleophilic. Thus, one having ordinary skill in the art would not know how to make a hydrophobic coating comprising those elements claimed in claim 21. Accordingly, only the case where the hydrophilic substrate is switched to hydrophobic is examined on the merits in this action.

Regarding claims 28-30, applicant does not describe in the specification a method as claimed in claim 21, wherein the ink-jet ink contains a water soluble ingredient which *switches* the *coating* from being oleophilic to hydrophilic. The only case supported by the specification is the case where a hydrophobic *substrate* is imaged with the hydrophilic coating by inkjet means. No *switching*, as defined by applicant, occurs. Thus, one having ordinary skill in the art would not know how to carry out the method as claimed in claims 28-30.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 24 requires that a hydrophilic image be created by the application of an aqueous ink via inkjet. However, claim 21, from which 24 depends,

provides a coating which is only hydrophilic (see above discussion of claim 21 in regards to the 112, first paragraph, rejection). It is unclear how an image can be created when there is no switching of hydrophilicity, as required by the last limitation of claim 21. As such, claim 24 could not be examined on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1, 2, 4-11 and 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fukino et al. (EP 1 057 622 A2).

Regarding claim 1, Fukino et al. disclose “a lithographic printing blank comprising a coating deposited from aqueous fluid onto a substrate (abstract), the coating comprising:

polyvinyl alcohol (paragraph 165, paragraph 246);

polyacrylic acid (paragraph 165, paragraph 246);

hydrophobic water-based emulsion with pH of 7 or below (paragraph 267);

aminoplast (paragraph 247); and

at least one wetting agent (paragraph 267).”

Regarding claim 2, Fukino et al. further disclose “wherein the coating is hydrophilic (abstract).”

Regarding claim 4, Fukino et al. further disclose "wherein the aminoplast is a urea-formaldehyde resin (paragraph 247)."

Regarding claim 5, Fukino et al. further disclose "wherein the hydrophobic water-based emulsion has a phenol formaldehyde as its internal phase (paragraph 266)."

Regarding claim 6, Fukino et al. further disclose "wherein the hydrophobic water-based emulsion has an acrylic polymer or copolymer as its internal phase paragraph 268)."

Regarding claim 7, Fukino et al. further disclose "wherein the coating has a dry coating weight between 1 gram per square meter and 4 grams per square meter (paragraph 284)."

Regarding claim 8, Fukino et al. further disclose "wherein the polyacrylic acid is present at between 20% and 60% of the dry coating weight (paragraph 165)."

Regarding claim 9, Fukino et al. further disclose "wherein the polyacrylic acid is present at between 20% and 40% of the dry coating weight (paragraph 165)."

Regarding claim 10, Fukino et al. further disclose "wherein the polyvinyl alcohol is present at between 1% and 15% of the dry coating weight (paragraph 165)."

Regarding claim 11, Fukino et al. further disclose "wherein the polyvinyl alcohol is present at between 3% and 6% of the dry coating weight (paragraph 165)."

Regarding claim 13, Fukino et al. further disclose "wherein the wetting agent comprises silicone surfactant (paragraph 319)."

Regarding claim 14, Fukino et al. further disclose "wherein the at least one wetting agent is present at between 0.5% and 7% of the dry coating weight (paragraph 277)."

Regarding claim 15, Fukino et al. further disclose "wherein the aminoplast is present at not more than 10% of the dry coating weight (paragraph 269)."

Regarding claim 16, Fukino et al. further disclose "wherein the aminoplast is present at between 2% and 7% of the dry coating-weight (paragraph 269)."

Regarding claim 17, Fukino et al. further disclose "wherein the aminoplast is present at between 10% and 20% of the dry coating weight (paragraph 269)."

Regarding claim 18, Fukino et al. further disclose "wherein the substrate comprises untreated aluminum (paragraph 288)."

Regarding claim 19, Fukino et al. further disclose "wherein the substrate comprises aluminum treated with phosphoric acid (paragraph 299)."

Regarding claim 20, Fukino et al. further disclose "wherein the substrate comprises anodized aluminum (paragraph 292)."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukino et al.

Regarding claim 12, Fukino et al. teach all that is claimed, but fail to disclose “wherein the hydrophobic water-based emulsion is present at between 25% and 55% of the dry coating weight.” However, Fukino et al. teach a range of concentrations in paragraph 269, and further teach that the emulsions are added to control the degree of hydrophilicity of the coating (paragraph 266). Further, Fukino et al. teaches ranges of concentrations for all of the components in the layer (see, e.g., paragraphs 272, 165, 270), suggesting that varying the concentrations of the various components is not only feasible, but encouraged. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, through routine experimentation, to choose a concentration of hydrophobic water-based emulsion between 25% and 55% of the dry coating weight in order to optimize the hydrophilicity.

8. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukino et al. as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Hallman et al. (US 5,820,932).

Regarding claim 3, Fukino et al. teach all that is claimed, but fail to teach that “the coating is oleophilic.” However, Hallman et al. teach the desire and ability to reverse the hydrophilicity of the printing plate coating (column 4, lines 45-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to change the hydrophilicity of the coating in order to meet the needs of the print job, such as when water-based ink is desired to be printed.

9. Claims 21-23, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukino et al. in view of Kawamura (US 2001/0019760) and Touhsaent (US 6,444,750).

Regarding claim 21, Fukino et al. teach "a method of preparing a lithographic printing plate (title), comprising the steps of:

providing a printing blank comprising a coating deposited from aqueous fluid onto a substrate, the coating comprising:

polyvinyl alcohol (paragraphs 165 and 246);

polyacrylic acid (paragraphs 165 and 246);

hydrophobic water-based emulsion with pH of 7 or below (paragraph 267);

aminoplast (paragraph 247); and

at least one wetting agent (paragraph 267)."

Fukino et al. lack the "depositing aqueous ink-jet ink onto said coating in the form of an image, whereby the imaged areas of said coating acquire oleophilic or hydrophilic properties which are opposite to the oleophilic or hydrophilic properties of said printing blank."

Kawamura teaches a method of forming an imaged printing plate wherein the hydrophilic surface is switched to hydrophobic by application of a catalyst via inkjet (paragraphs 83 and 84). The plate produced by the method of Kawamura doesn't undergo development, thus saving time in the printing process.

Further, Touhsaent teaches a method of making a polyvinyl alcohol coating hydrophobic by crosslinking with urea formaldehyde in the presence of an acid catalyst (column 1, lines 15-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply an acid catalyst via inkjet to the printing plate and coating of Fukino et al. in order to make the coating hydrophobic in the imaged areas, as taught by Touhsaent, in order to make a printing plate that does not require development, as taught by Kawamura, in order to save time in the printing process.

Regarding claim 22, Touhsaent further teaches heating in order to further crosslink the coating (column 5, lines 5-8).

Regarding claim 23, Touhsaent further teaches that the surface becomes hydrophobic, thus making a hydrophobic image when the acid catalyst is applied to the surface (column 1, lines 15-25).

Regarding claim 27, Touhsaent and Kawamura teach "wherein the ink-jet ink contains a water-soluble ingredient (the acid catalyst is water-soluble) which switches the coating from being hydrophilic to oleophilic (column 1, lines 15-25 of Touhsaent)."

Claims 25-26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukino et al. in view of Kawamura (US 2001/0019760) and Touhsaent (US 6,444,750), as applied to claim 21 above, further in view of Deutsch et al. (US 2002/0054981) and Tashiro et al. (US 5,556,583).

Regarding claim 25, Fukino et al., Kawamura and Touhsaent fail to teach “wherein the ink-jet ink contains a microencapsulated pigment.” However, Deutsch et al. teach the addition of an indicator into the ink in order that the imaged area can be identified (paragraph 37).

Tashiro et al. teach the encapsulation of ink jet pigments in order to create a more durable image (column 2, lines 17-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate encapsulated pigments in the inkjet ink in order to be able to identify the imaged areas, as taught by Deutsch et al., and so that the imaged areas are durable, as taught by Tashiro et al.

Regarding claim 26, the encapsulated pigment contains in its capsule a polymer binder.

10. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukino et al. in view of Kawamura (US 2001/0019760) and Touhsaent (US 6,444,750).

Fukino et al. teach a method of preparing a lithographic printing plate (title), comprising the steps of:

“providing a printing blank comprising a coating deposited from aqueous fluid onto a substrate, the coating comprising:

polyvinyl alcohol (paragraphs 165 and 246);

polyacrylic acid (paragraphs 165 and 246);

hydrophobic water-based emulsion with pH of 7 or below (paragraph 267);

aminoplast (paragraph 247); and

at least one wetting agent (paragraph 267)."

Fukino et al. lack the "depositing aqueous ink-jet ink onto said coating in the form of an image, whereby the imaged areas of said coating acquire oleophilic or hydrophilic properties which are opposite to the oleophilic or hydrophilic properties of said printing blank."

Kawamura teaches a method of forming an imaged printing plate wherein the hydrophilic surface is switched to hydrophobic by application of a catalyst via inkjet (paragraphs 83 and 84). The plate is then used "in a wet-lithographic printing press to produce printed impressions (paragraph 84)." The plate produced by the method of Kawamura doesn't undergo development, thus saving time in the printing process.

Further, Touhsaent teaches a method of making a polyvinyl alcohol coating hydrophobic by crosslinking with urea formaldehyde in the presence of an acid catalyst (column 1, lines 15-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply an acid catalyst via inkjet to the printing plate and coating of Fukino et al. in order to make the coating hydrophobic in the imaged areas, as taught by Touhsaent, in order to make a printing plate used in a wet-lithographic printing press that does not require development, as taught by Kawamura, in order to save time in the printing process.

Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukino et al. in view of Kawamura (US 2001/0019760) and Touhsaent (US 6,444,750), as applied to claim 38 above, further in view of applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA).

Regarding claim 39, AAPA teaches using a switchable polymer on a plate substrate that is a plate cylinder that is reused after a printing run (page 10, lines 6-11 off applicant's specification). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a plate cylinder as a substrate for the coating in order to save money by reusing the substrate.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D. Zimmerman whose telephone number is 571-272-2749. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R 8:30A - 6:00P, Alternate Fridays 8:30A-5:00P.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-2258. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2854

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Joshua D Zimmerman
Examiner
Art Unit 2854

jdz


JUDY NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER